

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 19-22. In response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2005, Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention so as to further describe the claimed invention. Also, claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in the specification on page 9, lines 12-22. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

II. The Rejection of Claims 1-18 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-18 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over USP No. 6,321,284 to Shinohara in view of USP No. 5,640,600 to Satoh. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other things, an arbitration information management section for managing a bus priority which is a fixed priority among the plurality of buses and a highest access priority pattern which indicates a highest priority in each time slot among the plurality of buses. At least this feature is not taught or suggested by Shinohara nor Satoh, alone or in combination with each other.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Shinohara fails to disclose an arbitration information management section for managing a bus priority order and a highest access priority pattern, and relies on Satoh to overcome this deficiency. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Satoh discloses such an arbitration management information section in column 6, line 52 through column 7, line 15. Satoh appears to disclose a bus control function wherein a bus monitor determines whether each bus is busy. A selection logic portion

determines the mode in which to use each bus based on a calculated bus activity ratio (see, column 7, lines 1-55). However, Satoh does not disclose a bus priority order which is *fixed* among a plurality of buses *and* a highest access priority indicating a highest priority within each time slot among the plurality of buses.

By contrast, the present invention, includes a fixed bus priority and a highest access priority. For example, Figure 3 depicts a bus arbitration table according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention. As depicted, Bus 0 has the highest fixed bus priority order and Bus 2 has the lowest. Additionally, for each time slot (0-9), one of the three buses has the highest access priority. The bus arbitration section may grant access to a resource based on both the highest access priority and the bus priority order.

Because neither Shinohara nor Satoh disclose an arbitration information management section for managing a bus priority which is a fixed priority among the plurality of buses and a highest access priority pattern which indicates a highest priority in each time slot among the plurality of buses, both reference fail to teach or suggest every claim element. Accordingly, as each and every element must be disclosed or suggested by the prior art (see, M.P.E.P. § 2143), and the combination of Shinohara and Satoh fails to do so, it is clear that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

III. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The Independent Claims From Which They Depend Are Allowable

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 1 is patentable for the reasons

Application No.: 10/673,191

set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:dab
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 3, 2006